



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/520,841	03/08/2000	Eisuke Atsuumi	566.38303X00	2626
20457	7590	11/03/2004	EXAMINER	
ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP 1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET SUITE 1800 ARLINGTON, VA 22209-9889				VOLPER, THOMAS E
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2665		

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/520,841	ATSUUMI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Thomas Volper	2665

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 09 August 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a)  The period for reply expires 5 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
  - b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1.  A Notice of Appeal was filed on 7 June 2004. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2.  The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
  - (a)  they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c)  they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d)  they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.

3.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5.  The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6.  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7.  For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8.  The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.

9.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.

10.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

  
**HUY D. VU**  
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
 TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600  
 Part of Paper No. 10282004

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The amendments to claims 2, 4, 5, 9, 11, 13, 14 and 15 change the scope of those claims and raise new issues that require further consideration. Specifically, the amendment to claim 1 creates new issues for claims 2 and 4, the amendments to claims 5 and 11 create new issues for claims 5 and 11, and the change in dependencies of claims 9, 13, 14 and 15 creates new issues for claims 9, 12, 14 and 15.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The amendments are not entered due to the new issues, and additionally the references used in the previous Office action still meet all the limitations presented in the claims. Applicant has argued that the references of Noiri and Takashima do not teach the use of the RS/ CD signal so as to allow the other information terminal to receive the user data through half duplex communication. However, as stated in the previous Office Action, Takashima discloses sending control information from a sending side to a receiving side that indicates there is data to be transmitted, and what kind of data is to be transmitted (col. 14, line 61 - col. 15, line 4 of Takashima). This control information meets the limitation of an RS/CD signal as in the present invention. Additionally, Takashima discloses sending information from a sending side to a receiving side, which meets the limitation of a half duplex communication. By simply adding these previously dependent limitations to the independent claims, the Applicant has not placed the application in better form for appeal or in condition for allowance.